Louisiana On-Site Review Framework

Notes on how domain scores are determined:

1. On-site review team members will analyze available evidence and will check all the criteria for inadequate before considering higher domain scores.
2. The team will use a preponderance of evidence within each domain to determine the score.
3. The guidance provided by this framework is not exhaustive and must be considered in the wider context of program quality.
4. Constraining criteria are indicated where relevant (i.e. the overall domain score can NOT be good or better if criteria X is not at least Good).
5. Likely sources of evidence are meant to serve as initial guidance and are not considered exhaustive.
6. On-site review teams will triangulate evidence in order to ensure scores capture typical aspects of the pathways and associated programs offered by the provider. Triangulation allows review team members to trace connections that might exist between a course and other sources of evidence as well as how similar pieces of evidence come to bear on more than one domain.
   a. For example: An onsite review team member will connect evidence from observing a program's early literacy course with evidence from observing candidates teaching reading with comments program completers, principals and faculty make about the quality of reading instruction. These three pieces of evidence could then inform scores in Domains 2 (Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods), 3 (Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance) and possibly even 4 (Program Performance Management).

DOMAIN 1: Quality of Selection

Context and Rationale: This domain addresses the program's responsibility to select candidates that show potential and/or fit for the teaching profession. This can be demonstrated in a variety of ways including standardized tests, pre-admission GPA, auditions, interviews, etc.

Essential questions being answered:
- What principles, criteria, and recruitment/selection practices drive selection of program applicants?
- What is the quality, as determined by pre-selection GPA and/or standardized test scores, of recent cohorts?
- What efforts are underway to make the program candidates and completers more representative of the student population of the schools and/or district(s) served by the program?

Likely sources of evidence for this domain:
- Data on pre-selection GPA of all candidates in most recent cohort
- Standardized test score data (ACT, SAT, GRE) for most recent cohort
- Demographic data on current cohort, most recent completer cohort, local or state K-12 students and teacher workforce
- Handbooks or policies outlining the program's admission criteria and process
- Conversations with program staff about selection criteria and recruitment initiatives
- State agency-provided data

24

Indicator 1.1 – Selection				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
GPA[7]	**All students** are selected with a **GPA of 3.0 or greater**.	**At least 75%** of admitted students are selected with **a GPA of 3.0 or greater**.	**Less than 75%** of admitted students are selected with **a GPA of 3.0 or greater**.	**GPA for more than 50%** of the selected students is **below 2.5**. –OR– The program is **unable to provide data** to review team on the individual pre- selection GPA of all admitted candidates.
Standardized Tests	Teacher candidates selected for the program are **drawn from the top third** of the national college going population, as measured by appropriate standardized tests.	Teacher candidates selected for the program are **drawn from the top half** of the national college going population, as measured by appropriate standardized tests.	Teacher candidates selected for the program are **drawn from below the top half but above the bottom third** of the national college going population, as measured by appropriate standardized tests (i.e., above the 33rd and below the 50th percentiles of the standardized test national distribution of test takers)	Teacher candidates selected for the program **are drawn from the bottom third** of the national college going population. –OR– The program is **unable to provide data** to inspectors on the individual ACT/SAT scores of all admitted candidates.

---

[7] All programs should be able to provide inspection teams with the pre-admission grade point averages (GPA) of all admitted candidates. During the 2016-2017 pilots, the team   will report on the mean and median GPA though it will not impact the numeric score for the judgment area.

Indicator 1.1 – Selection			
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Demographic Representation of enrolled candidates (may be ethnicity and/ or SES) [8]	The demographic profile of enrolled teacher candidates **makes a significant contribution, as shown by evidence that progress has been made over at least three consecutive years,** to a teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.	The program has a **written plan with clear objectives and timelines** for ensuring that selection contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program. – AND- There is **evidence that progress has been made** over the past two consecutive years.	The program **does not have a written plan but seeks in other ways** to select candidates that contribute to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program. – OR-There is **little evidence that progress has been made** on the written plan.	The program **does not produce a population** of teacher candidates that contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the K12 students and **has no concrete plans for becoming more representative** of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.
Demographic Representation of program completers (may be ethnicity and/ or SES)	The demographic profile of program completers **makes a significant contribution, as shown by evidence that progress has been made over at least three consecutive years,** to a teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/ or the districts served by the	There is **evidence that progress has been made** over the past two consecutive years in producing a cohort of program completers more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program. – AND- The program or institution has a **written plan with clear**	The program **does not have a written plan but seeks in other ways** to ensure that program completers contribute to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program. – OR-There is **little evidence that progress has been made** on the written plan.	The program **does not produce a population** of completers that contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the K12 students and **has no concrete plans for becoming more representative** of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.

---

[8] If available: compare to districts where graduates are hired or districts where candidates are placed for clinical placement (top 10 if more than 10).

26

Indicator 1.1 – Selection				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
	program.	**objectives and timelines** for ensuring that a diverse cohort of selected candidates complete the program in order to contribute to a more representative local teacher workforce.		
Admission Process (e.g. audition, interview, etc.)	The program uses **multiple measures**[9] in addition to standardized test scores and pre- selection GPA to determine fit and/ or promise for teaching in its admission process and has **evidence that these measures result in effective teacher candidates.**	The program uses **some measures** in addition to standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA to determine potential for teaching in its admission process and **monitors how these measures impac**t **candidate effectiveness.**	The program uses some **measures** in addition to standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA to determine potential for teaching in its admission process, but **does not monitor the impact** of the measures on candidate effectiveness.	The program **does not examine any potential or fit for teaching measures** beyond standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA.

---

[9] This may include measures beyond application and background checks such as recommendations, interviews, auditions, videos, micro-teaching, etc.

DOMAIN 2: Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods

Context and Rationale: This domain focuses on how well the program ensures teacher candidates acquire content knowledge and key teaching methods and skills needed to be an effective educator. On-site review focuses on coursework and related experiences offered by the program to develop the content knowledge and teaching skills of teacher candidates and the impact these bring to improving student learning. Multiple sources of evidence are used within this domain; one of these sources is direct observation of Louisiana teacher candidates during the one-year residency so that review team members understand how successfully coursework and related program content convey key content knowledge and teaching methods to all teacher candidates in the inspected program.

> *Note on English Language Arts and Mathematics criteria:* The specific criteria set forth in the framework are included as core, research-based components of developing P-12 students' literacy and mathematical skills. As such, reviewers will look for the specific aspects of literacy and math as outlined.

> *Note on online learning*[10]: The online program teaching faculty knows the primary concepts and structures of effective online instruction and is able to create learning experiences to enable teacher candidate success. This includes providing clear expectations, timely accurate feedback on assignments and assessments, active learning opportunities and use of assessments, projects, and assignments that meet learning goals and assess learning progress by measuring candidate achievement of the learning goals.

> *Note on alternate certification programs (MAT, PTP, Certification-Only):* On-site review will assess how the provider determines that its candidates have mastered relevant content knowledge before they complete a program, and how the provider responds to any content knowledge improvement that may be needed for admitted candidates as a result of the programs' assessment of their content knowledge.

Essential questions being answered:
- How does the provider ensure individual teacher candidates have a secure knowledge of their content (especially Scientifically-Based Literacy Instruction, math, other subject areas in elementary programs and secondary content areas for secondary programs)?

---

[10] For more information please see the National Standards for Quality Online Teaching
https://gsw.edu/Assets/Academic%20Affairs/files/IEP/NACOL_Standards_Quality_Online_Teaching.pdf

- How does the provider ensure teacher candidates are well equipped with key teaching techniques and methods (particularly classroom management, assessment, differentiation, academic feedback, questioning) to bring about advancements in student learning and achievement?
- What connections (e.g. scenarios, simulations, peer teaching, assignments) are made in courses between course knowledge   and its application to teaching practice?

Likely sources of evidence for this domain:
- Observations of program courses (including multiple sections of the same course when these are offered)
- Course syllabi
- Interviews with teacher candidates, program faculty/staff (including supervising teachers), school staff (mentor teachers,   principals), and recent program completers, with list of interview question prompts included in the corresponding handbook
- Program handbooks
- Observations of teacher candidates teaching
- Surveys of program completers and employers, other provider data (e.g., state agency provided data)
- Degree Plans, course catalogs

Note on "constraining criteria" for ELEMENTARY and ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Education Program Reviews: The quality of scientifically-based reading/literacy instruction delivered by the program to all teacher candidates **must be good or better** in order   for the final score on Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods to be good.

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge[11]				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
English Language Arts Teacher Content Knowledge and Pedagogy (To include content knowledge, strategies, and application	Coursework and training provide **comprehensive coverage** of scientific research/evidence based reading instruction within the 5 essential	Coursework and training **address** scientific research/evidence based reading instruction within the 5 essential components of reading	Coursework and training address some components of scientific research/evidence based reading instruction within the five essential	Coursework and training **do not enable** ELA teacher candidates to teach literacy including scientifically based reading instruction.

---

[11] Louisiana policy requires the use of Praxis content knowledge tests; while programs find this necessary in order to meet state requirements, it may not be sufficient in assessing   content mastery to ensure that all admitted candidates have a secure grasp of content knowledge.

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge[11]				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
defining learning goals for all learners at various stages of reading and writing development.)	components[12] of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction, consistently enabling ELA teacher candidates to teach students how to read effectively, ensuring that the **progress of *all* students is good or better.** These elements, as applicable to the certification grade band (e.g., early childhood, elementary, secondary), include: 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: ● Phonological processing and phonemic awareness ● Phonics instruction ● Spelling 3. Fluency 4. Comprehension 5. Vocabulary instruction	paired with elements of early literacy instruction, enabling ELA teacher candidates to teach students how to read effectively, *enhancing the progress and learning of the students they teach.* These elements, as applicable to the certification grade band (e.g., early childhood, elementary, secondary), include: 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: ● Phonological processing and phonemic awareness ● Phonics instruction ● Spelling 3. Fluency 4. Comprehension 5. Vocabulary instruction to include morphology	components of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction **and inconsistently enables** ELA teacher candidates to progress the learning of the students they teach. These elements, as applicable to the certification grade band (e.g., early childhood, elementary, secondary), include: 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: ● Phonological processing and phonemic awareness ● Phonics instruction ● Spelling 3. Fluency 4. Comprehension	

---

[12] Five essential components of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge[11]				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
(Continued: English Language Arts **Teacher Content Knowledge and Pedagogy)**	to include morphology 6. Grammar/syntax 7. Written expression 8. Formal/informal assessment practices that inform literacy instruction 9. ELL 10. Learning Differences to include dyslexia and students with learning disabilities as well as other learning needs.	6. Grammar/syntax 7. Written expression 8. Formal/informal assessment practices that inform literacy instruction 9. ELL 10. Learning Differences to include dyslexia and students with learning disabilities as well as other learning needs.	5. Vocabulary instruction to include morphology 6. Grammar/syntax 7. Written expression 8. Formal/informal assessment practices that inform literacy instruction 9. ELL 10. Learning Differences to include dyslexia and students with learning disabilities as well as other learning needs.	
Math Teacher Content Knowledge **Math Teacher Content Pedagogy**	Coursework and training address **all major math content areas[13] and key aspects of math pedagogy and consistently** enable teacher candidates to teach math **highly effectively**, ensuring that the **progress and learning of all students is good or better**.	Coursework and training address **all major math content areas and key aspects of math pedagogy and** enable teacher candidates to teach math **effectively** such that they **can enhance the progress and learning of the students they teach**.	Coursework and training address **some** math domains and key aspects of math pedagogy AND/OR **inconsistently** enable teacher candidates to teach math such that candidates can enhance the progress and learning of their students.	Coursework and training **do not enable** teacher candidates to teach math in order to enhance the progress and learning of their students.

---

[13] As identified in in Louisiana student standards

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge[11]				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
(ELEMENTARY)[14] Other subject areas	Coursework and training **consistently** enable teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to **teach highly effective lessons** in elementary subject areas (including literature, history/social studies, and science) so that the **progress and learning of all students is good or better.**	Coursework and training enable teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to **teach effective lessons** in elementary subject areas (including literature, history/social studies, and science) so that the **progress and learning of all students is good or better.**	Coursework and training **inconsistently** enable teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to **teach** elementary subject areas (including literature, history/social studies, and science) such that candidates can enhance the progress and learning of their students.	Coursework and training **do not enable** teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to **teach** effective lessons, particularly in elementary subjects (including literature, history/social studies, and science) in order to enhance the progress and learning of their students.
(SECONDARY)[15] Other subject areas	The provider **consistently assesses** mastery of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy of candidates and provides support where needed to ensure **comprehensive** knowledge of content so that coursework and training enable teacher candidates to teach secondary subjects **highly effectively** and the	The provider **assesses** mastery of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy of candidates and **usually** provides support where needed so that coursework and training enable teacher candidates to teach secondary subjects **effectively**, ensuring that they can **enhance the learning and progress** of the	The provider **inconsistently assesses** mastery of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy of teacher candidates, providing **little support** when necessary and/or coursework and training **inconsistently** enable teacher candidates to teach secondary subjects so that they are able to enhance the progress	There is little evidence that the provider assesses candidate mastery of content knowledge and disciplinary literacy. Coursework and training **does not enable** secondary teacher candidates to teach their secondary subject and as a result, **student learning is significantly inhibited.**

[14] Elementary includes early childhood PK-3, 1-5, and Integrated to Merged 1-5 programs
[15] Secondary includes Middle Grades 4-8 and Secondary Grades 6-12 core subjects (ELA, mathematics, sciences, social studies) and Integrated to Merged programs

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge[11]				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
(ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS) Content Mastery	**learning and progress of all students is good or better**. The provider ensures that **all** candidates **consistently demonstrate mastery** of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy, and the program has **clear evidence** that it takes steps to assess candidates' content knowledge, and where necessary provides **highly effective** support so that **candidates'** content mastery results in the **learning and progress of all students being good or better**.	students they teach. The provider ensures that **most** candidates demonstrate mastery of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy, shows evidence that it has taken steps to assess content knowledge, and has **some evidence** of providing support, where necessary, so that the **majority** of candidates' content mastery **enhances the learning and progress** of the students they teach.	and learning of the students they teach. The provider **inconsistently** ensures that candidates demonstrate mastery of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy, and/or there is **little evidence** that the program assesses their content knowledge and/or, where necessary, **provides little support** to enable candidates to have, or gain, content mastery as a result **student learning is inconsistent**.	The provider **does not ensure** candidates' ability to demonstrate adequate content knowledge and disciplinary literacy, and the program **does not have steps** in place to support candidates, where necessary, in gaining mastery of relevant content as a result **student learning is significantly inhibited**.

Indicator 2.2 Teaching Methods[16]				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
Classroom management	Coursework and training in classroom management	Coursework and training in classroom management	Coursework and training in classroom management	Coursework and training in classroom management

---

[16] Key teaching skills such as academic feedback and questioning, managing student behavior, assessment, and differentiation should be embedded and integrated into different content areas such that candidates fully understand how these key skills relate to or may differ across content areas.

	Indicator 2.2 Teaching Methods[16]			
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
	equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to manage behavior and discipline **highly effectively** and create a **positive and highly engaging climate for academic learning**. This includes **all** of the following: • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise for good behavior • handle disruptive student misbehavior.	**equip** teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to manage behavior and discipline **effectively** and create a **positive climate for academic learning**. This includes **all** of the following: • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise for good behavior • handle disruptive student misbehavior.	**inconsistently** equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to manage behavior and discipline effectively and create a positive climate for academic learning. Some of the following may not be present: • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise for good behavior • handle disruptive student misbehavior.	**does not equip** teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to manage behavior and discipline effectively and create a positive climate for academic learning. Several of the following may not be present: • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise handle disruptive student misbehavior. • handle disruptive student misbehavior.
Assessment	Coursework and training in assessment equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to **accurately assess** K-12 student performance and progress. This includes enabling them to utilize formative assessment results in their instruction so that **all** students, including those with	Coursework and training in assessment equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to **accurately assess** student performance and progress for **most** of their K-12 students, enabling them to utilize formative assessment results so that **most** of their students, including those with ESL,	Coursework and training in assessment **inconsistently** equip candidates to assess student performance and progress, including inconsistent use of formative assessment results in their instruction; not all students make at least good academic progress.	Coursework and training in assessment **does not enable** candidates to assess student learning and to use formative data to inform their instruction of students.

34

Indicator 2.2 Teaching Methods[16]				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
Differentiation	ESL, special education, and gifted needs, make at least good academic progress. Coursework and training prepares teacher candidates to **highly effectively** adapt the curriculum and differentiate for **all students** including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs, ensuring that **all students make good or better progress** in the lesson and over time.	special education, and gifted needs, make at least good academic progress. Coursework and training prepares teacher candidates to **effectively** adapt the curriculum and differentiate for **most** students including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs, ensuring **most students make progress** in the lesson and over time	Coursework and training **inconsistently** prepares teacher candidates to adapt the curriculum and differentiate to meet the needs of all students including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs.	Coursework and training **does not prepare** candidates to adapt the curriculum differentiate to meet the needs of students with varying learning needs.
Academic feedback and questioning	Coursework and training consistently equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, skills and understanding to **effectively** engage **all** students in **rigorous** learning through **highly effective** academic feedback that is timely, accurate and specific and **high-level** questioning where students and/or teachers **build off responses.**	Coursework and training consistently equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, skills and understanding to engage students in learning through **effective** academic feedback that is timely, accurate and specific and questioning that includes **higher-level, open-ended questions**.	Coursework and training **inconsistently prepare** teacher candidates to engage students in learning through academic feedback and questioning. Coursework and training **may not address key components** of feedback (timeliness, accuracy, and specificity) OR **does not address level and variety** of questioning.	Coursework and training **do not equip candidates** to engage students in learning through academic feedback and questioning.

Indicator 2.3 Connections to Practice[17]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Connections to Practice	Program coursework has **frequent and strong** connections to **immediate practice** such as: scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.	Program coursework **frequently includes appropriate and good** connections to practice and allow candidates to **regularly apply** learning. Examples include: scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.	Program coursework has **inconsistent** relevant connections to practice with **missed opportunities** to include: scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.	Program coursework has **few OR ineffective** connections to practice such as: scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.

---

[17] Candidates receive frequent opportunities to practice teaching methods, observe strong modeling of teaching methods and skills, and are provided with explicit, real world applications of the content knowledge and teaching methods presented in coursework.

DOMAIN 3: Quality of Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance

Context/Rationale: The final clinical experience (one-year residency) offers candidates the opportunity to apply the knowledge acquired through program coursework, prior pre-residency clinical experiences, and other activities. As such, it is essential that all candidates receive high-quality supervision and feedback. While candidate performance during observation is a central piece of evidence for this domain, review team members are **not evaluating teacher candidates** through these observations: they are judging the teaching and learning that results from the program's efforts to develop the knowledge and teaching skills of all candidates, **not the teacher candidate who is observed by review team members**. Evidence is gathered and judgments made within the wider goal of understanding program results and how these results are achieved. While the final clinical experience (one-year residency) is central to the domain, reviewers will include evidence on earlier pre-residency clinical experiences where appropriate.

> *Note on Alternate Certification Programs* (MAT, PTP, Certification-only)*:* For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as teachers of record who are enrolled in the program, the on-site review focus is on how well the provider ensures that all enrolled candidates are receiving the support and guidance needed to develop their teaching knowledge and skills and what interventions and supports are in place to address weaknesses in placements if/when they arise.

Essential questions being answered:
- How does the program structure the final clinical experience (one-year residency) and select the clinical placement site (for undergraduate programs)?
- How are classroom mentor teachers and/or supervisors at the program and school level chosen, trained, and supported by the program?
- What aspects of teaching and learning does the observation tool provide feedback on?
- What is the quality of the feedback candidates receive? Is it an accurate reflection of the quality of teaching and learning during the observed lesson?
- How consistent is the feedback provided by the program supervisors and classroom mentor teachers?
- Is the feedback constructive, actionable and likely to lead to improvement in teaching and learning practices?
- How do mentor teachers, principals, and/or program supervisors view the overall quality of teacher candidates?
- What is the impact of candidate teaching on student learning during the observed lesson?
- What is the evidence from onsite review with regards to the quality of teacher candidates?

Likely sources of evidence for this domain:

- Observations of teacher candidates teaching
- Observation of feedback provided by program supervisors to candidates
- Blank and completed observations and evaluation instruments
- Interviews with teacher candidates, program faculty/staff, and school/district staff (mentor teachers, principals, HR)
- Data on all program supervisor and/or mentor teacher observation scores and written comments for cohorts of teacher candidates in the reviewed program
- Program handbooks, MOUs, and/or other program documents with information on the selection, training and support of mentor teachers and supervisors
- Surveys of program completers and host school site administrators, other provider data (e.g., state agency-provided data)

Note on "constraining criteria": The quality of observation and feedback (Indicator 3.2) delivered by program supervisors to all candidates **must be good or better** in order for the key judgment on Quality of Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance to be good.

Indicator 3.1 – Clinical Placement				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
Clinical placement timing and length	Teacher candidates are consistently placed **at the beginning of the K12 school** semester (ideally at the beginning of a school year) and student teaching lasts for at least a **full K12 school semester**.	Teacher candidates are consistently placed **within the first two week**s of the K12 or preK12 school semester and student teaching lasts for **at least ten weeks.**	Teacher candidates are **not consistently placed within first two weeks** of the K12 school semester and/or lasts for **less than ten weeks but more than six weeks.**	Student teaching lasts for **less than six weeks.**

Indicator 3.1 – Clinical Placement				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Selection of clinical placement schools[18],[19] • **Ethnic diversity** • **SES** • **Academic performance** • **Distance from program location** • **HQ curriculum** • **State-trained Mentors**	High-quality placements ensure that teacher candidates gain **substantial practical experience** to develop their teaching skills effectively **in high performing and/or improving schools**, a **substantial portion of which** have a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).	Placements ensure that teacher candidates gain **practical experience** to develop their teaching skills effectively in placements where **most schools** are high performing and/or improving schools, **some of which** have a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).	Placements inconsistently ensure that teacher candidates gain **practical experience** to develop their teaching skills effectively in placements where **most schools** are high performing and/or improving schools, **some of which** have a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).	Placements **do not ensure** that teacher candidates are able to develop their teaching skills in schools that have at least some evidence of improving academic performance and also serve a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).
**During the LEARNING PHASE (2018-2019 and 2019-2020), this criterion will be for informational purposes only and the team will collect information on the placement school aspects bulleted above (ethnic diversity, SES, academic performance, distance from program location, HQ curriculum, state-trained mentors).				
Selection of mentor teachers[20]	Mentor teachers are **consistently chosen** based on demonstrated effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor.	Mentor teachers are **often chosen** for effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor.	Program **has selection criteria** that mentor teachers be chosen for effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor but **mentors inconsistently have these.**	There is **no clear rationale** for choosing mentor teachers for their effectiveness OR for their capacity to serve as mentors.
Clinical On-Site Supports (Alternative	Programs **consistently demonstrate** that **multiple supports** are in place for candidates who are teaching,	Programs demonstrate that they **provide some** onsite support for candidates who are teaching--**examples may**	Programs **inconsistently demonstrate supports** are in place for candidates teaching through onsite	Programs are **not able to demonstrate supports** are in place for candidates teaching. There is **little or**

---

[18] If available: compare to districts where graduates are hired or districts where candidates are placed for clinical placement (top 10 if more than 10).

[19] For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as the teacher of record who are enrolled in the program, this criterion does not apply. While not coming to bear on the score, review teams will note evidence of how the district fulfills this responsibility where relevant.

[20] For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as the teacher of record who are enrolled in the program, this criterion does not apply. While not coming to bear on the score, reviewer teams will note evidence of how the district fulfills this responsibility where relevant.

Indicator 3.1 – Clinical Placement				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
Certification Programs)[21] CONTINUED	including frequent visits to provide timely oral and written feedback that focuses on how well students are learning, as well as evidence that **strategic interventions** routinely take place to address weaknesses in candidate performance if/when they arise.	**include** frequent visits to provide timely oral and written feedback that focuses on how well students are learning, as well as **some evidence** that interventions take place to address weaknesses in candidate performance if/when they arise.	visits to assess candidate performance and/or there are **ineffective or few interventions** available if/when placement weaknesses arise.	**no evidence** of onsite support for candidates and/or **they do not make interventions** when weaknesses in candidate performance arise.

Indicator 3.2 – Observation and Feedback				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
Observation form(s) used by program supervisors and mentor teachers	Observation instrument includes **explicit focus on ALL**: • setting instructional outcomes • student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson • impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson • specific, research-based classroom	Observation and/or evaluation instrument **addresses all**: • setting instructional outcomes • student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson • impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson • specific, research-based classroom management strategies, • use of formative assessment to inform	Observation and/or evaluation instrument **addresses only some (3-4)**: • setting instructional outcomes • student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson • impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson • specific, research-based	Observation and/or evaluation **addresses few (1-2)**: • setting instructional outcomes • student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson • impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson • specific, research-based classroom management

[21]For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as teachers of record who are enrolled in the program, the review focus is on how well the program ensures that all enrolled candidates are receiving the support and guidance needed to develop their teaching knowledge and skills and what interventions and supports are in place to address weaknesses in placements if/when they arise.

Indicator 3.2 – Observation and Feedback				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
	management strategies • use of formative assessment to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs • academic feedback and questioning • candidate content knowledge	instruction • differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs • academic feedback and questioning • candidate content knowledge	classroom management strategies • use of formative assessment to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs • academic feedback and questioning • candidate content knowledge	strategies • use of formative assessment to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs • academic feedback and questioning • candidate content knowledge
Program supervisor and mentor teacher training on observation and evaluation[22]	All program supervisors and mentor teachers receive **regular substantive** training to **measurable standards for reliability** on methods and practices of high quality observation and feedback.	All program supervisors and mentor teachers receive **regular substantive training** on methods and practices of high quality observation and feedback.	Program supervisors and mentor teachers receive **minimal training, at least annually,** on the observation and/or evaluation instrument.	The program **does not provide training** on methods and practices of effective observation and feedback to program supervisors and mentor teachers who observe/host teacher candidates.
Quality of written and oral feedback	**Accurate written** and oral feedback after each required observation has a clear link to **evidence of student learning** during	**Accurate written** and oral feedback after each required observation **usually** has a clear link to **evidence of student learning** during the	Written and oral feedback after each required observation is inconsistent and/or **inconsistently** builds upon previous	Written and oral feedback after each required observation is **inaccurate and/or does not link to student learning** and does

---

[22] On-site review focuses on training and maintaining inter-rater reliability of all program and district/school observers.

Indicator 3.2 – Observation and Feedback				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
	the observed lesson, **strategically** builds on previous feedback, and identifies key actionable improvement steps.	observed lesson, builds on previous feedback and identifies **most** key actionable improvement steps.	feedback, **does not link** to student learning and/or does not directly identify key actionable improvement areas.	not identify key actionable areas for improvement.
Consistency of expectations for program supervisors and mentor teachers	Program supervisors and mentor teachers have **consistently high expectations** and work collaboratively to ensure **strong feedback that is accurate and highly relevant** to the needs of teacher candidates.	Program supervisors and mentor teachers **usually** have **consistent expectation**s and **mostly** work collaboratively to ensure that **feedback is accurate and relevant** to the needs of teacher candidates.	Program supervisors and mentor teachers **have inconsistent expectations** and/or feedback is **inconsistent or not always relevant** to the needs of teacher candidates.	Program supervisors and mentor teachers provide teacher candidates with **feedback that is not accurate or relevant** to needs of teacher candidates and expectations are not clear.

Indicator 3.3 – Candidate Performance				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
Student engagement and candidate impact on student learning during lesson[23]	**All students are engaged** in learning and candidate teaching **consistently advances** student learning during the observed lesson.	**Most students are engaged** in learning and candidate teaching **consistently advances** student learning for most students during the lesson.	**Students are inconsistently engaged** in learning and candidate teaching **inconsistently advances** student learning.	**Few students are engaged** in learning during the observed lesson and candidate teaching **does not contribute to** student learning.
Subject	Students benefit from	Students benefit from	Students **inconsistently**	Students have **few**

---

[23] In some cases, student learning can be ascertained by district or state value added measures but it may also be determined by direct observation of student work in the classroom, employer surveys, or other appropriate means. Reviewers will focus on engagement and student learning during the observed lesson.

Indicator 3.3 – Candidate Performance				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
knowledge	**accurate and high quality** content because candidates **consistently** teach **exceptionally well**, demonstrating **strong** subject knowledge, particularly in reading, writing, literature, history/social studies, math and science.	**accurate** content because candidates **consistently** teach **well**, demonstrating **good** subject knowledge, particularly in reading, writing, literature, history/social studies, math and science.	benefit from accurate content because candidates teach **inconsistently**, demonstrating **some errors** in subject knowledge, particularly in reading, writing, literature, history/social studies, math and science.	**opportunities** to benefit from accurate content because candidates are **unable to consistently demonstrate** subject knowledge to ensure that lessons are taught accurately **and/or inaccuracies in content adversely impact student learning**.
Teaching Skills and Strategies	Student learning and engagement are supported by teacher candidate ability to **consistently and highly effectively** demonstrate the use of these teaching and learning strategies: • setting instructional outcomes • classroom management strategies • formative assessment and its use to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning needs	Student learning and engagement are supported by teacher candidate ability to **consistently and effectively** demonstrate the use of these teaching and learning strategies: • setting instructional outcomes • classroom management strategies • formative assessment and its use to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning needs • academic feedback and questioning	Student learning and engagement **are not always supported** due to **inconsistent ability** of teacher candidate to demonstrate the use of these teaching and learning strategies: • setting instructional outcomes • classroom management strategies • formative assessment and its use to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning • academic feedback and	Student learning and/or engagement is **impeded by** teacher candidate **inability** to use one or more of these teaching and learning: • setting instructional outcomes • classroom management strategies • formative assessment and its use to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning needs • academic feedback and questioning

Indicator 3.3 – Candidate Performance				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
Feedback from recent graduates and principals of recent completers	• academic feedback and questioning Recent completers and principals of recent completers report that program completers make a **strong positive** impact on student learning without the need for targeted interventional professional development from the school or district.	Recent completers and principals of recent completers report that program completers make a **positive** impact on student learning without the need for targeted interventional professional development from the school or district.	questioning Recent completers and principals of recent completers report that **targeted interventional professional development** from the school or district **was sometimes needed** to enable the completers to improve their impact on student learning.	Recent completers and principals of recent completers report that **significant professional development was required** in the first year of teaching to ensure that teaching reaches an acceptable level of effectiveness and/or to ensure that pupils make expected levels of progress.

DOMAIN 4: Quality of Program Performance Management

Rationale/Context: This domain examines whether and how program leadership—*at all levels, including program faculty, partner district and school leaders, and mentor teachers*—utilize data to continually improve the quality of teacher preparation and outcomes for all teacher candidates. Program performance management gives careful attention to quantitative and qualitative data, review of data quality (e.g., reliable and valid measures of clinical performance and student learning), well-established processes for performance review and action steps based on that review, and broad involvement of faculty and administrators at all levels of the program in these monitoring and improvement processes. Program performance management also includes systematic and regular attention to the quality of program coursework and faculty teaching, taking into account their impact on relevant program outcomes and to the ability of all candidates to teach well as a result of the quality of course content and faculty teaching.

Quality assurance through effective program performance management takes place by building and sustaining a culture of continuous improvement that directly engages all members of the organization. Multiple sources of information are used to monitor the performance of individual candidates, cohorts of candidates, and cohorts of recent completers. This information leads directly to action steps to improve the program as well as follow up monitoring to gauge the impact of these improvement actions. Onsite review also focuses on the quality and accuracy of data used by the program to assess its own performance, in particular whether observation score data collected and reported by program supervisors is an accurate reflection of observed candidate practice and shows developing skills across time through successive observations.

Core concepts of program performance management are: full engagement of all members of the organization in continuous improvement activities; regular use of multiple sources of quantitative and qualitative information by all members of the organization working together; prompt action steps taken as the result of careful performance monitoring; the use of data to assess the effectiveness of steps taken in response to identified needs for improvement; and a sustained cycle of monitoring, acting on results, and assessing the impact of improvement activities embedded into the culture of the program.

Essential questions being answered:
- How do program leadership and faculty use a wide variety of information to understand candidate and cohort performance and make improvements to the program? How often?
- What is the quality of data about the program and who uses it? How does the program monitor the quality the data?
- Does the program have—and use—quality control gateways or checkpoints at the end of each program phase to decide whether a candidate is ready to move to the next phase? What data are used to make these decisions?

- Does the program have intervention plans for weaker students? For degree-seeking students who do not perform adequately, is there a non-certification degree track for them?
- How does the program monitor and take steps to improve the quality of coursework and teaching?
- How does the program leadership monitor connections between coursework and clinical experiences and ensure faculty know how well their students can implement course content?
- How does program leadership take action as a result of information? Frequency? Specificity/explicitness? What steps are taken to monitor the results of steps taken to make improvements?

Likely sources of evidence for this domain:
- Data over time (to include: teaching observations, evaluations, surveys, employment outcomes, impact of candidates and completers on student learning (where available), etc.)
- Observations of teacher candidates teaching and of program courses
- Courses taught through multiple sections or at multiple sites
- Observation of feedback provided to candidates
- Completed observation and evaluation instruments across multiple observations for whole cohorts of candidates
- Conversations with program faculty/staff, teacher candidates, and school staff (mentor teachers, principals)
- Program handbooks, MOUs, and/or other program documents
- Program or individual candidate improvement/intervention plans, action plans and results of the interventions
- Program outcomes such as employment, persistence, performance, feedback from graduates and employers, impact on student learning outcomes
- State agency-provided data

Indicator 4.1: Program Performance Management				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Quality of Data	Program collects and uses multiple sources of **high-quality internally and externally validated data** to monitor ongoing performance.	Program collects and uses **multiple sources of information**, most of which are high quality data, to monitor ongoing performance.	Program collects and uses **few sources of high quality information**, relying on data of **inconsistent quality** to monitor ongoing performance.	Sources of information collected and used for program monitoring are **not high quality data**.

Quality monitoring (data sources could include: program improvement plans, candidate completion rates, feedback surveys, internal reviews, faculty study groups, faculty/peer observations)	Program leadership **regularly and systematically monitors** overall quality of coursework, clinical experiences, and the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates. This includes **regular examination of** observation and feedback instruments and practices as well as **regular training** for mentor teachers	Program leadership **usually monitors** overall quality of coursework, clinical experiences, and the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates. This includes **review of** observation and feedback instruments and practices as well as **regular training** for mentor teachers.	Program leadership **inconsistently monitors** overall quality of coursework, clinical experiences, and the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates. Examination of observation and feedback instruments and practices is not regular nor is training for mentor teachers.	The program **does not take steps to monitor** the quality of coursework, candidate fieldwork clinical experiences, and/or the program's observation and feedback practices. Mentor teacher **do not receive at least annual training** to ensure consistency of approach in giving feedback to teacher candidates.
Internal quality control gates (or checkpoints) and intervention plans	Program leadership monitors candidate performance through internal performance checkpoints/gateways and utilizes data to ensure that all candidates **exceed high standards** of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into one-year residency, being recommended for licensure). The program has **formal interventions** (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance	Program leadership monitors candidate performance through internal performance checkpoints/gateways and utilizes data to ensure that all candidates **meet high standards** of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into one-year residency, being recommended for licensure). The program has **formal interventions** (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.	Program leadership **inconsistently monitors candidate performance** and inconsistently utilizes data to ensure that candidates **meet standards** of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into one-year residency, being recommended for licensure), and/or the program **inconsistently uses formal interventions** (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance	The program **does not monitor candidate performance through formal internal performance checkpoints/gateways** and/or the **expected standards are unclear**. The program **does not use formal interventions** (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.

47

	standards.		standards.	
Quality assurance and improvement planning	The program has and **regularly uses rigorous and well-embedded** quality assurance systems informed by high quality data about cohorts or groups of candidates and completers to **sustain high-quality outcomes**, and these processes are the basis for improvement planning and action steps.	The program has and usually makes use of **good** quality assurance systems informed by high quality data about cohorts or groups of candidates and completers to **sustain high-quality outcomes**, and these are the basis for improvement planning and action steps.	The program **inconsistently** makes use of quality assurance systems, and these quality assurance insurance **systems need improvement** to be used effectively in improvement planning and action steps.	Quality assurance systems are **not used to examine the effectiveness** of the program and secure further improvements in outcomes for individuals and groups of teacher candidates and completers.
Coursework-clinical connections	Program leaders **systematically monitor the quality of coursework and teaching** to ensure there are **strong connections** between program coursework and the clinical components of the program including shared information between the faculty who teach courses and those who supervise candidate clinical performance so that course instructors understand how well candidates are able to implement what they learn.	Program leaders **monitor the quality of coursework and teaching** to ensure there are **good connections** between program coursework and the clinical components of the program including shared information between the faculty who teach courses and those who supervise candidate clinical performance so that course instructors understand how well candidates are able to implement what they learn.	Program leaders **inconsistently monitor the quality of coursework and teaching** to ensure good coursework-clinical connections and/or **inconsistently monitor** how well information is shared between the faculty who teach courses and those who supervise candidate clinical performance.	Program leaders **do not monitor** the quality of coursework and teaching to ensure good coursework-clinical connections.

48